

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE SPECIFICATION

No amendments have been made to the Specification.

STATUS OF THE DRAWINGS

No amendments have been made to the Drawings.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-3, 9, 11-14, 19, 21-24, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,567,937 to Flores, et al. (hereinafter “Flores”). Claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 21, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0056151 to Makiyama (hereinafter “Makiyama”). Claims 5-8, 10, 15-18, 20, 25-28, and 30 were objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were otherwise allowable.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to include elements of allowable Claims 10, 20, and 30 respectively. Claims 10, 20, and 30 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3, 9, 11-14, 19, 21-24, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Flores. Claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 21, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Makiyama.

Amended Independent Claim 1 reads:

1. (Currently Amended)An apparatus for context-sensitive error event notification, the apparatus comprising:
a monitor configured to detect an error event within a computer application;
an analysis module configured to determine characteristics for the error event;
an assembler configured to compose a context-sensitive message comprising at least one context-sensitive resource relating to the determined error event characteristics; and
a transmission module configured to transmit the message to a set of addressees,
wherein the context-sensitive message is transmitted using a

communication method selected from the group consisting of e-mail, instant messaging, voice-over-IP, paging, audio messaging, and short message service (SMS).

(Claim 1)(emphasis added).

REFERENCE FAILS TO DISCLOSE ALL LIMITATIONS

“Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention.” *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Articulate Systems, Inc.* 234 F.3d 14, 20, 57 USPQ2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

As noted in the office action, “Claims 5-8, 10, 15-18,20,25-28, and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” (Office Action, 8-29-2006, pg. 5). Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation “**wherein the context-sensitive message is transmitted using a communication method selected from the group consisting of e-mail, instant messaging, voice-over-IP, paging, audio messaging, and short message service (SMS)**” from Claim 10. Claim 10 depended directly upon independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent Claims 11 and 21 are also not anticipated by Flores or Makiyama for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 1. Applicants further assert that dependent Claims 2-9, 12-19, and 22-29 are also allowable because of their dependence on allowable amended independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 respectively. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

As a result of the presented amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-29 with the current amendments, are patentable and in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required, the Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

____/David McKenzie/_____

Date: November 28, 2006

8 E. Broadway Suite 600

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Telephone (801) 994-4646

David J. McKenzie

Reg. No. 46,919

Attorney for Applicants